

REMARKS

Claims 6 through 10 are currently pending in the application.

This amendment is in response to the final Office Action of January 30, 2007 and Advisory Action dated April 11, 2007.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Claim Rejections

Claims 6 through 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

Applicants have amended the claimed invention to set forth the elements of the invention set forth in specification paragraph numbered [0027] and following. Applicants assert that presently amended independent claim 6 clearly complies with the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Obviousness Rejections

Obviousness Rejection Based on Akram et al. (U.S. Patent 5,866,460) in view of Pan (U.S. Patent 5,739,066)

Claims 6 through 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akram et al. (U.S. Patent 5,866,460) in view of Pan (U.S. Patent 5,739,066). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

Applicants assert that to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the cited prior art reference must teach or suggest all of

the claim limitations. Furthermore, the suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on Applicants' disclosure.

Applicants assert that any combination of the Akram et al. reference and the Pan reference fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 regarding the claimed invention of independent claim 6 because any combination of the cited prior art fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Applicants assert that any combination of the Akram et al. reference and the Lin et al. reference fails to teach or suggest the claim limitations of independent claim 6 calling for “forming a gate structure overlying the dielectric layer, the dielectric layer including a gate oxide layer, a polysilicon layer formed on the gate oxide layer and a metal silicide layer formed on the polysilicon layer and a dielectric cap formed on the metal silicide layer, a first sidewall and a second sidewall defining a first contact region, a second contact region and a channel region therebetween”, and “forming first, second and third subregions within the contact regions, each subregion having a dopant concentration that is different from that of the other two subregions, wherein forming said subregions comprises: introducing a first dopant into the substrate to form a first subregion, the first subregion being generally aligned with the sidewalls of the gate structure; forming a first single thin layer sidewall spacer of dielectric material overlying the sidewalls, the first single thin layer sidewall spacer formed by depositing a thin conformal layer of oxide dielectric material over the substrate and etching to a predetermined thickness over the sidewalls; performing an annealing/oxidation step at an elevated temperature; forming a second single layer sidewall spacer of oxide dielectric material the same as the oxide dielectric material forming the first single thin layer sidewall spacer overlying the first single thin layer spacer, the second single layer sidewall spacer having a thickness greater than the first single thin layer sidewall spacer; introducing a second dopant into the substrate to form the second subregion, the second subregion being generally aligned with the second single layer sidewall spacer; reducing the thickness of the second single layer sidewall spacer of oxide dielectric material the same as the oxide dielectric material forming the first single thin layer sidewall spacer to form a third sidewall spacer having a thickness intermediate the first and second sidewall spacers; maintaining the third sidewall spacer; and introducing a

third dopant into the substrate to form the third subregion, the third subregion being generally aligned with the third sidewall". Applicants assert that any combination of the cited prior art Akram reference and the Pan reference fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations of the presently claimed invention. Applicants assert that the Pan reference teaches away from any combination with the Akram reference because the Akram reference teaches or suggests the use of oxide material for each layer of the spacers while the Pan reference teaches or suggests the oxide material can only be used for the first spacer layer and a nitride containing material or non-oxidant material must be used for the second spacer.

Accordingly, Applicants assert that independent claim 6 is allowable as well as dependent claims 7 through 10 therefrom.

Applicants request the allowance of claims 6 through 10, and the case passed for issue.

Respectfully submitted,



James R. Duzan
Registration No. 28,393
Attorney for Applicants
TRASKBRITT
P.O. Box 2550
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: April 25, 2007

JRD/sfc:lmh

Document in ProLaw